

U. A. 39. 4
E X A M I N A T I O N

O F A

S E R M O N,

PREACHED IN THE

CATHEDRAL-CHURCH OF ST. PAUL, LONDON.

1888



6613
E X A M I N A T I O N

O F A

S E R M O N,

P R E A C H E D I N T H E

C A T H E D R A L - C H U R C H O F S T. P A U L, L O N D O N ;

B E F O R E T H E

R I G H T H O N O U R A B L E T H E L O R D M A Y O R,

T H E

J U D G E S, A L D E R M E N, A N D S H E R I F F S,

O N S U N D A Y, M A Y 25, 1788,

B E I N G T H E F I R S T S U N D A Y I N T R I N I T Y T E R M.

B Y T H E R E V. R I C H A R D H A R R I S O N,

C H A P L A I N T O H I S L O R D S H I P.

In one respect it was acknowledged the Church was in danger : there was an evil spirit, and a virulent temper, spread among the clergy : there were many indecent sermons, preached on public occasions. — These were dangers, created by those very men who filled the nation with this outcry against imaginary ones ; while their own conduct produced real and threatening dangers.

BURNET. OWN TIMES, v. iv. p. 135.

He who speaks against the false opinions they scatter, considers not priests, and their aim, which is to dazzle the stupid, and stupify the wife.

LIFE OF BARON TRENCK, v. iii. p. 67.

By B. S. Garrison, Editor of
Trinity College
Cambridge
L O N D O N :

P R I N T E D F O R J. J O H N S O N, N O. 72, S T. P A U L ' S C H U R C H Y A R D,

D M C C L X X X I X.

620

EXAMINATION

OF A

SERMON

PREACHED AT THE

CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. PAUL, LONDON

BY THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE THE LORD MAYOR

OF

LONDON, AT THE

CHURCH OF ST. MARTIN, VINCEY

ON THE 14TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1841

BY THE

REV. J. H. WATSON



Printed by J. H. WATSON, at the
CHURCH OF ST. MARTIN, VINCEY,
LONDON.

Price of the Sermon, 1s. 6d.

LONDON

Printed by J. H. WATSON, at the
CHURCH OF ST. MARTIN, VINCEY,
LONDON.

EXAMINATION

OF

Mr. HARRISON'S SERMON, &c.

IN A LETTER TO AN ATHANASIAN CHRISTIAN.

DEAR SIR,

I AM highly indebted to you for the extraordinary specimen of pulpit eloquence and argumentation, which you communicated to me the other day, in Mr. Harrison's sermon, before the Lord Mayor, on the first Sunday in Trinity term. You wish me to consider, with an attention its subject demands, a performance which has, I perceive, its weight with you; and to put down in writing, for our mutual edification, the objections that occur to me against what has been advanced by this *popular* preacher. I cannot help confessing, that, in my judgment, the best way to confute such an harangue, would be to print a great number of copies, and circulate them as extensively as possible. For the common sense of

B mankind,

mankind, if they would but give themselves the trouble to reflect and understand what they read, would recoil at the contradictions thus presented to them; and renounce a doctrine that admitted no better defence. There is one circumstance, however, in your last communication, which gives me infinite satisfaction: though you firmly embrace the creed, you wish not to adopt the practice, inculcated in the discourse. Notwithstanding you suppose me to hold opinions which your admired teacher repeatedly brands with the title of profane and impious*, and against which he as often calls for the exertions of the civil power; yet you write to me with your wonted cordiality and affection, and would, I flatter myself, drop a tear, were you informed of my being convicted upon the statute of William and Mary in this world, and doomed without doubt to perish everlastingly in the next. You know not what spirit you are of. Consistently with your preacher's instructions, you should abhor me as an enemy of God and man; as a subverter of the church of Christ; and consequently of the civil government, with which it is, in these kingdoms, connected. You should have pronounced my sentence,

—"Thou shalt live, an interdicted wretch,
All rights of nature cancell'd—"

and

* "I shall," says Mr. Harrison, "enter the lists against these *prophane*, these scornful, unbelievers," p. 2. 'As the Socinians *impiously* assert,' p. 5. 'As a modern skeptic has *impiously* dared to affirm,' p. 15, 16. 'Those *impious* mortals who divest the great author and founder of our faith of his divinity.' Harrison's sermon before the Lord Mayor, on the first Sunday in Easter Term, p. 9.

and when thine earthly existence is at an end, thou shalt inevitably be condemned to 'eternal death, in the gospel sense of it, which is a *life* in eternal misery †.' But we are daily sensible that the understanding and humanity of our fellow creatures teach them, in fact, to regulate their conduct in a manner far more evangelical, than would result from the principles, they, under the name of christianity, profess; and that if any individual were to act in society, according to the inferences he might fairly deduce from the articles, canons, and liturgies of established churches, he would, like Ishmael, "be a wild man; his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him."

The preacher proposes to direct his attempts against

Those daring, and (with concern, says he, I mention it) at present but too numerous and fashionable, adversaries, who endeavour to destroy the chief corner-stone thereof, the church, by divesting the great author and founder of our faith, and creator of all things, of his divinity, and reducing him to the condition of a creature only. With the powerful weapons of our sacred charter in my hands, I shall enter the lists against these prophane, these scornful, unbelievers, and endeavour, with the apostle, to prove, that, 'without controversy, great is the 'mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the 'flesh.' † And then, 'whether it be right in the

B 2

fight

† Harrison's sermon at the election of a Lord Mayor, 1788, P. 4.

† 1 Tim. iii. 16. Mr. Harrison's text.

sight of God, to hearken unto men, more than unto God, judge ye. p. 1, 2.

Having announced his design, Mr. Harrifon apologizes for the difficulty of the subject; and asserts, that the doctrine he maintains, is to be found in scripture :

That God himself should descend on earth to reconcile rebellious man to his offended maker; that unbounded immensity should be circumscribed in the womb of a virgin; that eternity should be born; that he, who created heaven and earth, should lie exposed in a manger; that there should be at the same time a finite and mortal man, and an infinite and immortal God, substantially united in the same person, and dwelling upon this habitable earth—are such great, without controversy great, and incomprehensible mysteries, that we may as well pretend to mete out heaven with a span, as fully to apprehend them. p. 2.

Had Mr. Harrifon asserted that some of these positions were the most inconceivable absurdities, and the rest, the grossest contradictions in terms that could be pronounced by the tongue of man, he would have spoken truly. What can we think of the infinite, immortal, omnipresent God, descending from heaven to earth, to reconcile man, that had rebelled against him, to his offended self; to endure the scoffs, indignities, and death on the cross, inflicted on him by the offenders; to appease his own wrath, satisfy his own justice, and manifest his own abhorrence of sin? What can we think of the Creator of heaven and earth, lying exposed in a manger? What can be an injurious and derogatory representation of the Almighty, what can be properly

perly *blasphemy*, if this be not? Can there be a stronger contradiction in terms, than immensity, which admits no bounds, limited, and circumscribed, within the womb of a virgin? Eternity, or an eternal being, born; a circumstance which implies both a time of his birth, and a time previous to it? How is it possible that the infinite, immortal God, who is one intelligent being, and a finite mortal man, who is another intelligent being, should be substantially united in the same person, *i.e.* so as still to make only one intelligent being? The author of this paragraph, if he ever indulge himself in poetical flights, may be supposed capable of writing something equal to the following air, in a much applauded Oratorio, intituled *Redemption*, part iii.

“ Oh! the magnitude of meekness!
 “ Worth from worth immortal sprung!
 “ Oh! the strength of infant weakness,
 “ If eternal is so young!”

SMART'S Psalms.

These assertions our preacher may, if he pleases, call great and incomprehensible mysteries; but no one who knows the scriptural sense of that word, will attend to him the more on that account. *Mystery* signifies, in holy writ, a *secret*; which ceases to be mysterious, the moment it is disclosed. There are no mysteries mentioned by the apostles and evangelists, but such as are at the same time said to be *revealed* and *made known*. Of this kind are the designs of God, which related to the call of the gentiles: the change that will take place in those true disciples, who shall be alive upon earth at Christ's second coming. The plan the Almighty intended to pursue, on these, and other important occasions, was a mystery;

tery ; was hidden from the wise and prudent of former ages ; but is now explained and made manifest, by the declarations of our Lord and his apostles. (See Rom. xvi. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 51.) That *mystery*, in scripture, ever signifies a *dark sentence*, an inexplicable doctrine, has never yet been proved.

But, though we cannot fully apprehend these important truths, yet we ought cheerfully to yield our assent to them, because we find them clearly revealed in the sacred writings. p. 2.

I will not stay to argue, that such doctrines as these must invalidate the credit of any revelation, received upon tradition, which indisputably contains them. For no human testimony can be sufficient to procure our assent to propositions so palpably contradictory to common sense. I will meet my opponent on his own ground ; and flatly deny that we find any such positions, either clearly or obscurely revealed in the sacred writings. He produces his proofs : I will examine them one by one.

• Were we engaged in the perusal of any ancient author, among those we stile *profane*, should it happen that the received interpretation of any particular passage implied no less than that the venerable sage had been guilty of writing absolute nonsense ; this circumstance alone would convince us, that he had been misunderstood ; and that it was necessary, in candour, to try whether his words were not capable of a different meaning. We should be tempted to admit any harshness of construction, or boldness of figure, rather than acquiesce in what it is inconceivable any man in his sound judgment should utter. Why should not

not the sacred writers be favoured with a similar indulgence? and why should it be thought *impiety* to question the orthodox exposition, when this strong presumption lies against it, that it exhibits the author upon whom we comment, as dictating absurd impossibilities? With this difficulty the explanation, given by Mr. Harrison of the text he assumes, has to struggle. So replete with absurdity is the doctrine he would make it support, that no man, who understands what he is speaking, if a different one could be met with, would adopt it. 'God was manifest in the flesh:' i. e. according to him, the person who appeared on earth, in a human form, and under the name of Jesus Christ, was God himself. Jehovah, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, was confined in the womb of a woman, and limited under a human body—whom no man hath seen, or can see, was made manifest, and seen, and handled by men—who only hath immortality, died on a cross. Any interpretation the words will bear must be preferable to this. I will produce you one, countenanced by the whole tenour of the sacred writings. * And, without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh—that is, The divine Being interposed; his wisdom and power were communicated to a man *, and exerted by him. The Almighty was manifest, not by himself immediately, but by the instrumentality of a creature, his messenger, by whom he did miracles, and signs, and wonders,

But alas! the sons of reason will not allow to faith its proper work; having drank deep of the

B 4

Socinian,

* *Flesh* signifies *man* as mortal. If. xl. 5, 6. Acts ii. 17. Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16. See Col. ii. 1.

Socinian, or Unitarian stream (for the affinity is evident, however subtle the modern distinction may be,) they will not believe what they cannot comprehend; they will not allow that 'without controversy great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh.' P. 3.

If by these sons of reason we are to understand *rational christians*, I am acquainted with none but such as do allow to faith its proper work. They receive every thing they are persuaded comes from God, and is revealed in scripture. They allow that 'Great is the mystery of godliness; and that God was manifest in the flesh;' though they do not interpret that passage exactly according to the prevailing opinion. With respect to the affinity between the Socinian and Unitarian stream, there are two points, not indeed of a very subtle and metaphysical nature, in which Socinus differs from the Unitarians, and has the honour to resemble the orthodox of the present day. These are, his worshipping Christ, and his readiness to persecute those who would not, in the persons of Davides and Palæologus.

Of the Unitarians we are farther told, that

Reasoning with themselves, but not aright, they assert that our Redeemer was but a precarious being, depending as much on the will of God as any other creature, and consequently himself but a creature. P. 3.

Whether they reason right or wrong, they imagine they have their lord on their side, who tells them, "I do nothing of myself: but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." (John viii. 28. v. 19, 30.) As he is repeatedly called, by himself

himself and his apostles, even after his ascension, a *man*, they conclude him to be a *creature*: yet still so far superior to any other creature, as the Almighty empowered him to do *works which none other man*, at that time, *did*, (John xv. 24.) and hath now, “exalted him far above all principalties, and powers, and every name that is named.”

But how absurdly must the great apostle here have said, ‘without controversy great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh,’ if our Saviour was mere man? That a man may be born of human parents, is so far from being an inconceivable mystery, that it is the most self-evident and obvious truth that can be proposed to the understanding, and can only be rendered obscure by pretending to give an explanation of it; and no explanation of it can serve the Socinian scheme, without making the apostle speak thus ridiculously, ‘without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, human nature was manifested in the flesh.’ P. 3.

No answer can be given to this paragraph, but by an appeal to yourself, my friend, whether the explanation I have offered, ‘The deity, his attributes of wisdom and power, were displayed by the instrumentality of a man,’ be the same with that which is here fathered upon the Socinians, ‘*Human nature* was manifested in the flesh’—by an appeal, whether I fix an absurd meaning on the apostle’s words, when I assert, that our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom God did many miracles, and brought to pass the important plan of redemption, was, except in what related to his extraordinary commission, mere *flesh* and blood, a mere man. Does the term *mystery*, in this place relate to the incarnation of God, or his assuming the human nature into the divine; or to the birth
of

of Jesus? Does it not refer to the *gospel*, as a scheme for the promotion of godliness and virtue, of which Timothy was a minister; which had been long kept secret in the counsels of Providence, but was now disclosed? "I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say."

But I shall not rest this important truth only upon the passage of scripture before us, but proceed to shew from several other places of sacred writ:—

1st. The divinity of our Saviour pre-existent to his humanity.

2d. The reality of his human nature, and his assuming it into the divine, which he had with the Father from all eternity.

3d. That the scheme of man's redemption could stand consistently only upon this great foundation; that Jesus Christ was God and man.. P. 3, 4.

Our preacher's proofs of his first point, are as follows:

• I saw the Lord, says Isaiah, upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple; and above it stood the seraphims, and one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts,—the whole earth is full of his glory: And that our saviour is here intended, we find in John, the 12th and 4th where the Evangelist is confessedly speaking of him, and pointing out the amazing infidelity and judicial blindness of the Jews, by a quotation from that prophet: 'He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them.' These things, said Isaiah, when he saw his glory, and spake of him. This is a clear proof of the divinity of

of Christ, pre-existent to his humanity. An holy evangelist affirms, if the words of an inspired evangelist have any weight, that he, whom Isaiah saw encompassed with seraphims, and worshipped by them as most holy,—was Christ,—consequently he was the eternal God, for such acclamations belong to none but the great Jehovah, God blessed for evermore. P. 4, 5.

What the evangelist affirms, is, not that he whom Isaiah saw, encompassed with seraphims, and worshipped by them as most holy, was Christ; but that the prophet, when he uttered the verse St. John has quoted, saw the glory of Christ, and spake of him. He saw, *i. e.* he foresaw, his glory, as Abraham saw Christ's day; and Daniel saw the son of man coming in the clouds; an event that had not happened before his crucifixion. But what is understood by Christ's *glory*? Is it the splendor of the divine appearance in the temple; or the glory, of which (it is said by the seraphims) the whole earth is full? No! these are expressly ascribed to Jehovah, the Lord of Hosts: and it is a plain assumption of the point we ought to prove, to say that they are either of them attributed by John to Christ; or that Jehovah and Christ are the same being. What then is the glory of Christ which Isaiah saw? It bears no reference to the splendor of the vision; or to the honour accruing to the Almighty, as creator of the earth: but (as is intimated in the words cited by the evangelist, *that they should not---be converted, and I should heal them,*) it is the glory our Lord would in after times derive from being appointed, in the determinate foreknowledge of God, the instrument to convert and heal mankind, and save a remnant of the Jews—from being invested with the power of
working

working miracles for that purpose—from the admirable virtue with which he executed his commission—from the splendid reward to which he should in consequence attain. Any thing, in which a man may pride himself, is called his *glory*; a title by which David denominates his tongue, his power of praising God; and St. Paul calls the wife, the glory of her husband. Christ's glory therefore here means nothing but his ministry; by which, glory would be ascribed to God, in the highest and first degree; and to himself, in the second place, as the servant of the Almighty, in whom he was well pleased. This was what Isaiah saw, as destined to come to pass, in an age posterior to his own. Nothing, that can be urged from this passage, prevents our affirming, that Christ did not exist when Isaiah prophesied; and that the appellation *most holy* belongs, exclusively of him, to Jehovah, God blessed for evermore.

St. Paul writes, 'that our Saviour took not on him the nature of angels, but took upon him the seed of Abraham.' Here is an undeniable argument of the eternal divinity of Christ before his appearing in the flesh; for he, in whose free choice it was to take upon him either of those two natures—that of angels, or that of men,—must necessarily have been a person existing before he made that choice; and also of a different nature from either of those two natures,—one of which he was pleased, in the fulness of time, to take into his own. It is evident then, that he could not be a man only, as the Socinians impiously assert; nor even one of the highest rank of angels, as the Arians, though with more seeming honour to our Saviour's person, yet with equal repugnancy to his word and doctrine, affirm: He must then be God, there being no third nature

nature besides the divine that could be ascribed to him. P. 5.

Before he advanced this argument, Mr. Harrison should have apprized his hearers of the sandy foundation on which it is built. If we turn, in our Bible, to Heb. ii. 16. we shall find the words, on which alone it is established, (*the nature of*) printed in Italics, as not read in the original; and supplied merely by the judgment, or the prejudice, of the translators. Had he dealt fairly, he should have acknowledged that other divines, not less learned than himself, had given different expositions of the passage. One of which is, 'For verily he (Christ) took not hold of (so as to assist by his mediation) angels, but he took hold of the seed of Abraham, *i. e.* men: the beings he undertook to succour, were not angels, but men.' Another interpretation he might have produced: In the preceding verse the apostle says, 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part [was a partaker] of the same; that, through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage.' Ver. 16. 'For verily *IT* [the fear of death] taketh not hold of angels, but taketh hold of the seed of Abraham.' Christ therefore, as it was necessary for him to die, must have been a man, (which is meant by *the seed of Abraham*), and could not be an angel; on whom death, or the fear of it, could take no hold. According to these expositions, the apostle says nothing of *two natures*, out of which Christ was to take his choice; and of his existence previous to that choice. Mr. Harrison ought to have informed his

his *venerable auditors*, that the text he quoted, was of much too disputable interpretation, for the establishment of the doctrine he wished it to support.

He proceeds—

Accordingly he who (the apostle says) took upon him the seed of Abraham, tells us of himself, ' before Abraham was I am. I am; declaring hereby, not only his existence, but his essence;—not only that he was, but what he was; no other than the Lord Jehovah,—he whose incommunicable name is I am;—as he himself spake to Moses, I am hath sent me unto you. P. 5.

Here our preacher avails himself of *two* inaccurate translations; the one of Exodus iii. 14. the other of John viii. 58. It is well known to the learned, that in the former passage, the literal version of the original words is, *I will be, what I will be.* In the preceding verse, “Moses said unto God, Behold when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers has sent me unto you, and they shall say to me, What is his name? What shall I say unto them?” In answer to this, “God said unto Moses, I will be, what I will be.” Stay not to enquire my name: I will shew you who I am, by the miracles I will enable you to perform: I will convince you that I am the Lord of Nature, and your deliverer. ‘*I will be with thee.*’ ver. 12. Miracles were wrought by the hand of Moses, to shew that there was none like unto the Lord his God, (Exod. viii. 10.)—that the earth is the Lord’s (ix. 29.)—that I am Jehovah (x. 2.) In the latter part of the verse we read, not the incommunicable name, *I am*, but *I will*

will be, (*i. e.* your deliverer from Egypt) hath sent me unto you.' We may safely then deny, that this passage of scripture represents the Almighty as taking the phrase, *I am*, for his proper incommunicable name; but entitles himself in the future, *I will be*, merely with reference to what he designed to achieve, in favour of the oppressed Israelites. In like manner, John viii. 58. ought to have been translated, 'I am he;' *i. e.* the Messiah, the Son of God, that should come into the world; as the words are indeed rendered in the same chapter, ver. 24, 28. The meaning is, without any allusion to the above communication between God and Moses, 'I am he that was appointed to come into the world, in the determinate foreknowledge of God, before Abraham was born.' The plan of the redemption was settled, the lamb was slain, the gospel was ordained, grace was given, christians were chosen, in the divine prescience, from the foundation of the world *. Just as, in the old Testament, (Isa. xlv. 1.) Jehovah is represented as having anointed, and spoken to, Cyrus, and held him fast by the right hand, before he was born. (Ver. 56.) 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day,' (the time in which the Almighty determined to send me) 'and he saw it, and was glad.' The Jews, to ridicule what they could not confute, answered, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?' Jesus never intimated that he had: his assertion was very different. He therefore only declares, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' (he whose day was to be seen, whose coming was ordained.) Christ existed before Abraham,
in

* See Rev. xiii. 8. 1 Cor. ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 9. Eph. i. 4.
2 Thess. ii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 20.

in the same sense that his day existed, when Abraham saw it—in the prescience of God. Mr. Harrison's argument leans on two supports, and if either of them be invalid, as I imagine them both, must fall to the ground.

It is written in the first chapter of the evangelist St. John, that 'the Word was God'—and that, that 'Word was made flesh.' p. 6.

But it has never yet been proved, that wherever the term *the Word* occurs, there we must understand Christ, the second person of the trinity, a third part of the indivisible godhead. Here it undoubtedly means, the divine wisdom*, that attribute of God personified, by which he created and governs all things. 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth; he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast.' And it must be observed, that the text in question asserts, as positively as language can do, that the Word was not Christ, but God. It is true indeed that Jesus is sometimes called the word, wisdom, power, of God, as being one person among many, and the chief of them, that have been commissioned to display those divine perfections. He was peculiarly inspired with that wisdom, and invested with that power: but it does not follow that the converse of that proposition is true; that the Word of God invariably denotes Jesus Christ. It already appears in what sense *the Word was made flesh*. The wisdom and power of God were bestowed on flesh, *i. e.* on a man, who was actuated by them alone, and whose
sole

* Proverbs viii. 22—31.

sole business it was to display them. The word of God became the leading principle of Jesus; and, as the mind is the man, might be called the man himself. This text by no means countenances the hypothesis of an *union* between the divine and human natures. If literally interpreted, according to the orthodox idea, it must signify, that the *whole* of the deity, that is, a *third part* of him, did not assume, but was converted, or transubstantiated, into flesh, as the water at the marriage feast in Cana, was not mixed with, but changed into wine.

The Redeemer himself tells us, that 'he and the Father are one;' that he 'came forth from the Father;' and, 'what, if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before?' p. 6.

In what sense (John x. 30.) our Lord says; 'I and my Father are one,' will appear if we read the foregoing verse. 'My Father which gave them me (my sheep) is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.' In this respect my Father and I are one, that he gave me my sheep, and will secure me in the possession of them—he will enable me to bestow on them eternal life. However the powers of this world might pluck them out of my hand, yet my Father, who is *greater than all*; and *a fortiori*, than myself; will not suffer me to be deprived: and it is the same thing whether He or I retain them; (John xvii. 10.) The unity between God and Christ, is of the same nature with that between Paul and Apollos; (1 Cor. iii. 8.) not of *substance*, but of interests and designs. In this sense our Lord prays to God, that all

C

' those

‘ those whom thou hast given me, may be one, as we are.’ (John xvii. 11.)

When Christ tells us he came forth from the Father, he means, not that he had any prior existence with him, or quitted the heavenly regions to descend upon earth, but that he received a public commission from him. The phrase is equivalent to being sent from God, as John was. ‘ That *coming from God*, and *coming forth from God*, was well understood by the Jews, as signifying nothing more than being a prophet of God, is demonstrated (says an eminent writer) by that declaration of Nicodemus, (John iii. 2.) ‘ We know that thou art a teacher come from God ; for no man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him. Observe, this learned jewish ruler believed Jesus to come from God, to be a prophet, though he was not yet convinced he was their great promised prophet, the Christ, the Messiah.’

‘ What and if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before ?’ This alludes to the vision recorded by Daniel, (vii. 13.) when he saw one like the son of man, coming in the clouds of heaven, to whom was given dominion. What, says our Lord, would ye say, were ye to behold me ascending up into heaven, where Daniel saw the representation designed to prefigure me ? This was the signal prediction on which the Jews expected their Messiah, as about to come in the clouds of heaven : and here our Lord applies it to himself, without asserting that he existed a day before his birth of Mary. It was in prophetic vision only, that Daniel beheld him.

Some writers are of opinion, that ‘ where he was before,’ relates to Christ’s having been *figuratively* in heaven, to receive instructions, and a commission

commission from his Father; as Paul was; in imagination, caught up into the third heaven.

Hear also that solemn address of Christ just before his passion: 'And now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' p. 6.

Here is a prayer to the supreme deity, which, even if Mr. Harrison's interpretation be admitted, proves not that Christ was the most high God, but that he pre-existed only; and that, not from all eternity, but prior only to the creation of the world. But the true meaning appears to be this: Our Lord was going to his Father; (John xvii. 11. 13.) he therefore supplicates, 'And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self,' in thy mansion, at thy own right hand, 'with the glory which I had with thee,' in thy contemplation*, 'before the world was.' In the 22d verse Jesus proceeds, 'and the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them.' Whence it is plain that he had not yet possessed it; else why did he pray for it; and, as the reward of his services? We see likewise that he himself had *given*, promised it, to his disciples, in the same sense the Father had given it him. All which shews, that he had at that time received it, only in the foreknowledge of God.

C 2

And

* 'With thee' will bear the sense I have here affixed to it, and does not necessarily imply *in the company of*. Luke i. 30. where the same preposition is used, 'Thou hast found favour with,' in the breast of, 'God.' Acts xxvi. 8.—'incredible with you,' in your judgment. See also Wisdom ix. 10. in the greek. Though this criticism is not material to the argument, yet I think it actually expressed by St. John, how Christ had glory before the world was: viz. in the breast of his Father.

And again, 'no man has ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, the son of man who is in heaven.' Which being spoke by our Lord while he was yet on earth implies, that he so came down from heaven as to be still there; that is, in respect of his divinity, by which he is every where present. p. 6.

Well said, Mr. Harrison! Christ, *i. e.* the divine nature, so came down from heaven, as to be still there. By virtue of the same ^{divinity} ~~ambiguity~~, he was upon earth, before he came down. This appears a very *mysterious* mode of travelling. A being comes *from* a place, so as to leave himself behind; and *to* a place, where he was before his arrival! How can we conceive an omnipresent deity capable of local motion? It was thought an absurdity in a poet to write,

' Britain to meet Nassau was so inclin'd,
' She ran so fast, she left herself behind.'

But a similar trope is to be received without a smile, when uttered by a sound divine. Unfortunately, the being who descended, and yet is in heaven, was the son of *man*, the human nature: and the passage intimates, that he had ascended before his descent. The whole resolves itself into a *figurative* account Jesus gives of his receiving his commission, couched under the idea of his ascending into heaven, to be instructed by his Father, and returning to communicate what he had there learned. With respect to the clause, 'who is in heaven,' it has been repeatedly observed, that the phrase may be rendered, 'who was in heaven,' with the same propriety, that the same participle in the original, is made to refer to past time, (John ix. 25.) 'Whereas I *was* blind, now I see.' Nor can the son

son of man, if we will imagine him to talk intelligibly, be supposed to assert that he was in heaven, at the time he spoke.

To strengthen these testimonies of Christ's divinity, from all eternity, let us add some of those passages where he is absolutely called God. p. 6.

What testimonies have been produced of Christ's divinity from all eternity, you, my dear friend, may be better able to apprehend than I am. Some few have been cited, to shew that God and Christ are the same being; and others, that Christ existed, before he was conceived in the womb of Mary. But this is very different from proving, that he was the second person of a trinity; had two natures, and existed from all eternity. Most of the texts your orator has quoted, if interpreted as he would wish, go no farther than to support the Arian doctrine; which he abjures; though he thinks it not quite so impious as the Socinian. Let us, however, return; and see whether he succeeds better, in pointing out passages where Christ is absolutely called God.

Take heed to yourselves, and to the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood, p. 6.

The blood of God! the infinite, immortal, uncreated deity shedding blood! The man that could entertain this conception for a moment, must suppose the Almighty to resemble the divi-

ilities in the Iliad, two of whom were wounded by Diomed.

From the clear vein a stream immortal flow'd ;
Such stream as issues from a wounded God.

POPE, B. v. l. 421, 1050.

Happily for those, who do not esteem God such an one as themselves, the best manuscripts of the original, instead of the ' church of God,' read the church of *the Lord*, i. e. Jesus : others the ' church of *Christ* : ' so we have the greatest external authority against such an expression as *the blood of God*, and against the argument which some men would deduce from it, that Christ is God, in addition to its intrinsic absurdity,

Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." p. 6,

Before Mr. Harrison had adduced this text as an indisputable proof of the godhead of Christ, he should have confuted other expositions of it, given by men who look a little farther than an english translation of the new Testament, before they pronounce what is the doctrine of scripture. He should have informed his ' venerable auditors ' that the passage may run thus : " of whom," i. e. of which Jews, " as concerning the flesh, Christ came. God *be* blessed for ever." Or, " of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ, who is over all, came. God *be* blessed for ever." Here the *coming* of Christ means not his descent from heaven, but his origin, (as every man *cometh* into the world, John i. 9.) of the jewish nation. Christ may be said to be over all, as the head of all believers, jews and gentiles. He should have told

told them, that by a very slight emendation, which, though only conjectural, yet from its aptitude, is probable in the extreme, viz. by the transposition of two words, one of which consists of one letter, the other of two, the passage is rendered as beautiful a climax as any in the apostle's writings—‘ whose are the fathers, and ‘ of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ [came], ‘ whose is God, over all, blessed for ever.’ To whom, to which Jews, the ever blessed God belongeth, as he condescendeth to call himself, in a peculiar manner, their God, and the God of their fathers. (Rom. ix. 4, 5.) All these opinions our preacher should have invalidated, before he had, from this text, declared Christ to be God blessed for ever.

And such epithets are also added to the word God, when applied to our saviour, as restrain it to the highest and most proper signification. He is called, in holy writ, the true God, the great God, the mighty God: in a word, the fullest titles of divinity are given to him; such as the Lord of Glory, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords. p. 6.

The observation Mr. Harrison sets out with, proceeds upon a wrong principle. It supposes that all the titles, applied by the sacred writers to express the Almighty, are appropriate to him; whereas there is only one that is so, (Jehovah). The rest are borrowed from human language; and are no other than men have been accustomed to make use of, to denominate their princes and potentates. Thus the term *God* signifies, not the underived essence of the deity, but any person, whether human or divine, who is possessed of power. Moses is called a *God*. The Psalmist

denominates some of his contemporaries *Gods*; Exodus xxii. 28, a text quoted by Mr. H. on another occasion*, we read 'Thou shalt not revile the gods [*Judges*, margin] nor curse the ruler of thy people.' There is not a term in scripture, let it be connected with what epithet it may, that will, if applied to Christ, prove him to be Jehovah. It is a misrepresentation to say that he is called the true God. John v. 20, runs thus, in the original; 'And we know that the "son of God is come, and hath given us an "understanding, that we may know him that is "true," viz. the Almighty, "and we are in him "that is true [by being] in, [by being disciples "of, by means of] his son Jesus Christ. This "[He] is the true God, and eternal life." Let any man judge who is meant by the true God, in this last clause; whether "He that is true," or "his son Jesus Christ." What nonsense to say, the true God, is the son of him that is true!

Nor is Christ meant by "the great God," Tit. ii. 13. The great God, Jehovah himself, will appear, at the day of judgment, by the events that will then take place; which will be such as to evince that he who is Lord of the universe could alone bring them to pass. He will judge the world, by Jesus Christ. In this text, God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, are expressly distinguished.

The next expression from which the divinity of Christ is argued, is, "the mighty God," If. ix. 6. It is rather unfortunate, that in the same verse, this mighty God should be represented as a child

* Sermon before the Lord Mayor on the first Sunday in Easter Term, 1788, p. 4.

child born, a son given to the Jews; and that, when the government should be placed for ever upon his shoulder, the zeal of ~~the~~^{the} superior being, the Lord of Hosts, was to perform it. But allowing, what might be much disputed, first, that the prophecy relates at all to Christ; and, secondly, that the reading presented to us in our received Hebrew bible, and in the english version, be authentic, yet still, as has been not long since observed, the term *God*, means no more than *potentate*; a very proper title for a person who was once a child, and raised afterwards, by the Lord of Hosts, to sit on the throne of David, and to govern his kingdom.

The title, *Lord of glory*, occurs twice. (1 Cor. ii. 7, 8.) ‘ But ~~we~~ we speak ~~of~~ the wisdom of God in a mystery; even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world to our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.’ *i.e.* the dispenser of the glory, mentioned in the foregoing verse. Yet our Lord was not the sovereign disposer of it; but himself received it from his father. (John xvii. 22. 24.)

The other text, in which the phrase “ Lord of glory ” is found, is Jam. ii. 1. Here it is remarkable, that the words “ the Lord,” are not in the original. The greek may be translated according to an idiom, frequent among the writers of the old Testament, often imitated by those of the new, “ My brethren, have not the glorious faith of our Lord Jesus Christ,” or, “ the faith of our glorious Lord Jesus Christ, with respect of persons,”

If

If the appellation "King of Kings" points out Jesus as the most high God, so it did Nebuchadnezzar. (Dan. ii. 37.) And the title of "Lord of Lords," is much of the same import; the term "Lord" being frequently, in the old Testament, connected with that of "king." Christ, when his kingdom is consummated, will be Lord of Lords, not as being the Almighty, but "prince of the kings of the earth." It is owing to the appointment of his father, that he is Lord in any sense. "God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both, Lord and Christ." Acts ii. 36. "To this end, Christ both died and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Rom. xiv. 9. Had he been God, he would have been Lord of the dead and living, without dying, and being brought to life again.

And as creation is ascribed to him in the most extensive sense of the word, so, with respect to the creatures, he is called, "The everlasting Father."
p. 6, 7.

From its being affirmed, that creation is ascribed to Christ in the most extensive sense of the word, we should be led to suppose, that he is represented as creator of the heavens, and the earth, of man, animals, and plants. Great, therefore, must be our surprise, when we find Moses ascribing this work to God, exclusively of every other being: to the LORD God, Jehovah. (Gen. ii. 4. 7. 9.) Nor is this all; for we read of God, in direct contradistinction to Jesus Christ, as creator of the universe, in the prayer preferred by the apostles; (Acts iv. 24.) "Lord,"
sovereign

sovereign master, " thou art God which hast
 " made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all
 " that in them is---against thy holy child*,
 " [servant,] Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both
 " Herod and Pontius Pilate were gathered to-
 " gether---grant---that signs and wonders may
 " be done by the name of thy holy child *,"
 [servant] " Jesus." Again, (Acts xvii. 24---31.)
 " God that made the world---hath appointed a
 " day in which he will judge the world---by that
 " man whom he hath ordained." The same
 conclusion results from comparing Rev. iv.
 10, 11, with chap. v. 6. As no passages are
 produced in which Christ is said to have created
 any thing, I shall only observe in general, that
 the creation, of which he was the author, is a
 moral one---a reformation of manners and dis-
 position, in those, who, at the time of his preach-
 ing, had spent the former part of their lives in
 religious ignorance and licentiousness---begun in
 consequence of their believing him a teacher sent
 from God. " If any one be in Christ," he a
 convert to the gospel, " he is a new creature."
 Believing jews and gentiles, considered as a
 society, are called " the whole creation." (Mark
 xvi. 15. Col. i. 15.) And Jesus, the author of
 their faith, and moral change, is represented as
 the instrument in the hands of God, by whom
 they were " created unto good works," not as
 natural men, but by " putting on the new man,
 " which after God is created in righteousness,
 " and true holiness." Now had Mr. Harrison
 condescended to adopt bishop Lowth's transla-
 tion, he would have found the more exact version
 of

* The same word is here used in the original, which, in
 ver. 25, is applied to David, and rendered *servant*.

of the words our Bible renders "The everlasting Father," to be "The Father of the everlasting age:" which, when applied to Christ, signifies, not the creator of all mankind, in a literal sense, but the introducer of an age, or dispensation, for the promotion of piety and virtue, which would endure for ever, and comprehend only a part of the human species. I now leave it with you to judge whether the point is proved---whether these texts convince sober enquirers of the divinity of Christ ---and whether he who has urged them, in a tone sufficiently decisive, has a right to conclude this head by saying,

These are expressions too positive for the profoundest criticism to invalidate, or the most subtle sophistry to argue away. p. 7.

Having thus shewn that Christ was the eternal God, I proceed, 2ndly, to consider the reality of his human nature. 7.

It may be asked why the second head is proposed, in this place, differently from what it stands in the general division of the sermon. Our preacher seems to have forgotten that he was to consider, not only the reality of Christ's human nature, but also his assuming it into the divine, which he had with the Father from all eternity. It seems somewhat mysterious, that the orthodox notion of incarnation, should be, not by conversion of the godhead into man, which appears the more obvious interpretation of "the word was made flesh," but, by taking the manhood into God.

But I think I may wave the consideration of this part of our subject; it certainly cannot be needful to enter

enter upon the proof of Christ's human nature; for, though he, that is both God and Man, was as early denied to be man as God; yet the now prevailing heresy, and from which at present the true faith is in most danger, is so far from taking from him the true nature of man,—that it will allow him to have truly no other. I shall therefore conclude both these heads, with the following observation: That, though we had none of those many plain and positive assertions in holy writ, of the two distinct natures of our blessed Lord, yet the bare history of his actions upon earth, a simple narrative only of his life, his miracles, his death, and resurrection, would be sufficient to prove him,—what it is our duty to believe him to be,—both God and man. If, when you read his history, you find that he hungered,—thirsted,—ate,—drank,—slept,—awoke,—wept,—sorrowed over Jerusalem,—suffered the most grievous pains both of body and soul,—and finally, death itself;—what can be more apparent than that he was perfect man as we are? p. 7, 8.

Most certainly he was perfect man: and his being so, excludes at once his being perfect God. It is an absurdity, and the grossest contradiction in terms, to suppose that he could be two different beings at the same time. He was, and he was not, God! He was, and he was not, man! he did, and he did not, know, the day of judgment! Mere theological legerdemain! Let us hear the prophet Ezekiel's decision, in a case somewhat similar. "Thou," prince of Tyrus, "hast said
 " I am a god—yet thou art a man, and not God
 " —thou shalt be a man, and no god in the
 " hand of him that slayeth thee." (xxviii. 2. 9.) The prophet's words plainly imply, that he who was man, could not be God; and that his being slain,

slain, was a sufficient proof that he was not. But we will go on, and see the circumstances in Christ's life, adduced to prove him God.

If you also find there, that he forgave sins,—cast out devils,—knew the thoughts of men's hearts,—walked upon the waves,—and had the winds and seas at his command :—and lastly, that he raised himself from death to life, and ascended up into heaven : what can be more evident than that he was perfect God also, and equal to the Father, as touching his godhead ? p. 8.

With respect to the works here referred to, we answer, in general, that we have our Lord's authority to declare that he could, of himself, do nothing—the Father that dwelt in him, he did the works, (John v. 19. 30. xiv. 10.) Here I would wish to observe once for all, that supposing the divine nature properly to be united to, and dwell in the man Jesus, it was the Father, not the son ; the first, not the second, person of the trinity. If we examine the particular instances of divine power our Lord exhibited, we shall find them no proofs of the divinity of his *nature*, because they were displayed by those who were confessedly men ; or expressly ascribed to the operation of God. If he forgave sins, did not all the apostles receive a like commission ? “ As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you—whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted to them,” (John xx. 21. 23.) Did he cast out devils ? It was ‘ with the finger of God,’ (Luke xi. 20.) Did he know men's thoughts ? So did Peter, in the case of Ananias : so did all those converts who were endued with a power of *discerning spirits*. Did he walk upon the waves ? so did Peter. Did he

he calm the winds and the sea? Immediately before he wrought this miracle, he was asleep, till his disciples awakened him, (Matt. viii. 26.) And we know the prophet Elijah, to deride the idea of Baal being a god, told his worshippers, 'Peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awakened,' (1 Kings xviii. 27.) On the subject of his raising himself from the dead, let us read his own words; (John x. 18.) "I have power to lay it," my life, "down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." We are repeatedly informed, that it was God who raised up Jesus from the dead. And if his ascension into heaven be a proof of his equality to the Father, as touching his godhead, how can we deny that Elijah was perfect God?

It is therefore necessary to everlasting salvation, that we believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the right faith is, that we believe and confess, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man, or, as it is expressed in the text, God manifested in the flesh. p. 8.

Where is the necessity here alluded to, insisted on? In a composition which, as we are well assured, was forged two, if not four*, centuries, after the decease of its reputed author. In defining the right faith to be this, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the son of God, is God and man, we contradict the new Testament. For there we find that the saving faith, was to believe in the Lord Jesus; not that he was God the son, or God and man, but that
he

* 'It was never heard of before the 8th century.' Burnet, Art. 8. p. 106.

he was sent as a teacher from God ; that he was the Messiah, the Christ, the anointed (for these three terms are of the same import) of God. " Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Acts xvi. 31.) " I believe," said the eunuch, to qualify himself for baptism, " that Jesus Christ is the son of God." (viii. 37.) " If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x. 9.) Can we learn from these, or any other texts of scripture, that it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that we believe the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that he is both God and man?

But of this we shall be farther convinced, if we consider, 3dly. That the scheme of man's redemption could stand consistently only upon this foundation, that Jesus Christ was God and man. p. 8.

Indeed ! Let us see how this is made out.

When man had transgressed the law of God, he knew not what method to take to appease, nor which way to fly to escape his displeasure. How could he hope for redemption without remission? And how could remission be expected, without satisfaction to the divine justice? And how could satisfaction be made to the divine justice, unless God's honour was repaired, and man's nature renewed. Now, all this could never be effected by a sinner, nor by the most innocent creature, not the sublimest angel—not all the angels in heaven could do it: for, the utmost, that even the most innocent of that order could hope for, was to recommend himself to the divine acceptance; and therefore could never merit any thing for others.—Beside, being but a creature,

creature, consequently finite, he never could make satisfaction to infinite justice. p. 8. 9.

When man had forfeited the divine favour by his transgressions, he certainly knew not how to regain it, but by a revelation from the Almighty, on what terms he might be restored. Remission was to be expected on such conditions, and no other, as God himself was pleased to appoint. But in what page of the jewish or christian scriptures do we read that remission could not be expected, without satisfaction to the divine justice? On the contrary, it is said to be attainable by a sincere repentance. "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness which he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." We read of no preparatory steps; taken by a second person in the trinity to appease the first, induce him to satisfy his justice; and propose such a dispensation. This is not the language of holy writ. With respect to the repair of God's honour, and the renewal of man's nature, both these ends are attained by repentance: This implies a submission to laws that have been violated; an acknowledgment of authority that has been trampled upon; and cannot take place without a change of disposition in the penitent: which is all that can be reasonably understood by a renewal of his nature.

'All this could never be effected by a sinner;' says Mr. Harrison;

Yes! by the sinner who was to receive remission, and no other: For the idea of an innocent creature, the sublimest angel, or all the angels in heaven, being unable to merit any thing for

D

others;

others ; and of infinite justice being incapable of satisfaction from a creature, who is finite ; is mere declamation and romance.

It cannot then be conceived, that any being could reconcile God and man, unless he had both their natures united in one person, and therefore had an equal interest in both. But, no such person as this was to be found in the whole creation, neither among angels or men. Man, therefore, seemed as desperate and forlorn as could be imagined ; but yet God was pleased to consider him as his creature, though he was become a sinner ; and to remember his own design in creating him, which was to celebrate his praises, to imitate his perfections, to glorify his name, and to be for ever happy. Hence, if it be lawful for us to speak of God after the manner of men, there arose a debate betwixt the divine justice, and the divine mercy ; the former urging man's deserved doom, the latter pleading for the suspension of it, and man's deliverance from it. p. 9. 10.

Here we have evidently two Gods : the God that was to be reconciled ; and the divine nature that was to inform the human, the second person of the trinity : whereas our Lord imagined that it was the *Father* who dwelt in him. But that any foreign intervention was necessary to induce the Almighty to be reconciled to the world, is a doctrine totally unscriptural. Observe the parent running of his own accord to meet the prodigal on his return. Read the frequent declarations, " God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son." And this is our preacher's own opinion, if we read a subsequent sentence : ' God ' was pleased to consider man as his creature, ' though he was a sinner ; and remember his own ' design

design in creating him—to be for ever happy. The God then that was to be reconciled, had, it seems, an interest in the happiness of man, without the interposition of another being, in whom the godhead was united to the manhood: (such a person as was not to be found in the whole creation, nor hath been hitherto!) How does Mr. Harrison get off the benevolence of the deity, which he is forced to allow? By dividing him also into two natures, the inexorable; and the benign; justice and mercy. Here we have the Almighty divided against himself, *debating* which attribute he should listen to, like Jupiter, weighing the fates of the Greeks and Trojans in a balance.

This was a state of things that puzzled all created wisdom. p. 10.

And well it might, since it produced a pause and *debate* in the breast of the deity himself.

This was a difficulty which the most glorious of the Cherubims and Seraphims were not able to solve; but, (oh! the infinite perfections of God,) in this extremity his sovereign wisdom interposed, and found out a way to reconcile the demands of justice, and the pleas of mercy. p. 10.

Where do we read any thing in the new Testament about the demands of justice, or that Christ did any thing to satisfy them? All there is mercy: "God is love."

This heavenly wisdom proposes, Immanuel, or, God with us, to be the mediator, to do all that was necessary to reconcile God and man,—and to restore man to a capacity of pleasing God, and of being for ever happy. In this expedient did divine justice and

mercy both agree; and the second person of the ever blessed trinity consented to undertake, and accomplish, all that was requisite for this purpose. p. 10.

Here also we have two Gods, the proposer of the redemption, and the mediator, who was to undertake and accomplish all that was necessary for the purpose. No! replies Mr. Harrison, it was only the second person of the ever blessed trinity. He may call them by what names he pleases, as God, No. 1; God, No. 2; and imagine, if he can so persuade himself, that he has still only *one* God: yet it appears to common understandings, that these *divisions* of the *undivided* divinity have opposite offices; are the two parties that *agree*, or bargain, for the redemption; are distinct agents, divine intelligent beings, Gods. Otherwise, the one God, being offended with his creatures, yet remembering his design in creating them, to make them happy; and debating with himself, whether he should indulge his loving-kindness, or satisfy his justice, resolves, at last, to reconcile himself to them. And for this purpose he proposes it to himself, and agrees with himself, to reconcile himself to men, and restore them to a capacity of pleasing himself. In consequence he is made flesh, becomes incarnate, (which means, that he assumed the human nature into the divine) appears a god-man, mediator between himself and man---because he would not otherwise have had proper interest in himself and man. He sends himself from heaven to earth, in the character of his own son; is insulted, scourged, and put to a most painful and ignominious death, by those creatures who had before offended him, so that he could not be reconciled to them for what they had already done, without
this

this extraordinary measure---And all out of his mercy, to appease himself, and satisfy his own justice. These may appear adorable mysteries to some men, but to meaner mortals they seem to favour of absurdity.

This merciful overture was published to our first parents, and their posterity, at various times, and in such degrees as the divine wisdom thought proper; and, at the last, in the fulness of time, God was made manifest in the flesh, and the son was sent by the Father, to be the saviour of the world, p. 10.

Overtures of mercy have indeed been made in all ages of the world; but no intimations that it was to take place in the manner described by Mr. Harrifon. And, at the last, in the fulness of time, God was manifest in the flesh: a human creature bearing evident marks of a divine commission, and that God was with him, appeared: the man Jesus (who from his eminent virtue, the appointment he received, and the dominion to which he will hereafter be advanced, is called, like other men in similar situations *, yet more emphatically, not God the son, but the son of God, and the Christ †) was sent, by the Father of the universe to be the saviour of the world, to reclaim them from sin, by the instruction, example, and well authenticated recompence he has proposed to them.

D 3

Thus

* All christians are called *sons of God*, John i. 12. Rom. viii. 14. Phil. ii. 15. 1 John iii. 1.

† Christ, or the anointed, a title of office, 1 Sam. xii. 3. Ps. cv. 15. Isai. xlv. 1.

Thus, it is evident that the scheme of man's redemption could stand consistently only upon this great foundation, that Jesus Christ was God and man. p. 11.

Upon the idea, that there is but one God, and that Jesus Christ is this one God, I have shewn the scheme of the redemption, as exhibited by Mr. Harrison, to be a farrago of absurdities.

And however mysterious this dispensation may seem, yet it effectually displays the perfections of God, and lays us under the strongest obligations to devote ourselves to his worship and service. p. 11.

It induces all men who attend to it, without better information of the real design of christianity, and the genuine contents of the gospel, to become either enthusiasts or unbelievers.

It demonstrates, in the most wonderful manner, the love and goodness of God, in designing the redemption of mankind, and sending his son for that purpose. p. 11.

But according to the scheme of these divines, was not an equivalent paid to the Almighty for the ransom of sinners? Where then were his great love and goodness, in sending his innocent son to suffer, that he might be reconciled?

It magnifies the condescension of Christ, in assuming our nature, and undertaking and accomplishing the great work for us. p. 11.

We want scriptural evidence of the fact, that Christ did pre-exist in the divine, and at a certain
tain

tain time assumed the human nature. If he did, there must be two divine beings, the sender and the messenger.

It shews the accursed nature of sin, and the indignation and severity of God against it : and it gives us every desirable encouragement to repentance ; since we are sure, that the atonement made by our saviour was sufficient, and that his intercession in heaven must be prevalent, for the remission of those sins of which we sincerely repent. But, above all, it assures us, that there is no other name under heaven given to man, by which he may be saved, but that of our Lord Jesus Christ, because there can be no other of equal dignity. p. 11.

Where, in scripture, is the divinity, or the death of Christ urged to exhibit the cursed nature of sin, and the indignation of God against it ? This is a mere assumption of divines, in consequence of what they suppose to be a scriptural doctrine, the death of God, to reconcile another God, which was all the while himself, to sinners. The inducements to repentance offered by the gospel, are the unwillingness of God that any should perish, (2 Pet. iii. 9 ;) the goodness of God, (Rom. ii. 4 ;) the offer of pardon, (Acts iii. 19 ;) the certainty of a future life, (xvii. 30 ;) And with regard to a prevalent atonement, and proper intercession of Christ, now in heaven, for us, I should be glad to see it reconciled with what our Lord declares, (John xvi. 26, 27.) “ I say ^{not} unto you that,” after my ascension, “ I will pray the Father for you ; for the Father himself loveth you.” The love the Father bore them would supersede the necessity of their master’s intercession. Nor is it with the greatest discretion, that the circumstance of Christ’s name

D 4

being

being the only one by which men must be saved, is urged as a consequence of his being God. Since it is adduced, by Peter and John, as a proof only of the power now attained by Jesus Christ of Nazareth, who had been crucified, and whom God had raised from the dead, (Acts iv.)

But, though the divinity of the redeemer is clearly revealed in the sacred writings, and it was thus evidently necessary that his godhead should be joined to his human nature; yet, still the language of the unbelieving philosopher is, How can these things be? How can eternity be made subject to time? How can omnipotency be joined with infinity? How can infinity be comprehended in a finite creature? p. 12.

That the divinity of the Redeemer is clearly revealed in the sacred writings, and that it was evidently necessary that his godhead should be joined to his human nature, is the point in dispute. But who is this *unbelieving philosopher, unbeliever, modern skeptic* †? It cannot surely be the author of *Letters to a philosophical Unbeliever*; a person, whom it is not for me to commend any other way, than by silent astonishment. He is indeed one who believes in christianity, with an assurance, equaled only by the contempt he entertains for the wretched misrepresentations of it, exhibited in the systems and declamations of some who call themselves orthodox. And thus it will happen universally; the firmer faith a man has in the gospel itself, the more entirely will he despise the doctrines which these divines so pertinaciously defend, and which it is impossible that any one, whatever honest minds may persuade themselves, should

† p. 15. The orthography is Mr. Harrison's.

should in fact believe, Not that we need be philosophers to discover the absurdity of the propositions contained in the following questions: we require only common understanding; a power of knowing the import of the words we utter; and of perceiving whether the ideas we annex to them agree or disagree. 'How can eternity be made subject to time?' *i. e.* in the present case, how can a being who existed *before* all time, be born, or come into existence, *in* time? To assert that he can, is a contradiction in terms, 'How can infinity be comprehended in a finite creature?' It is a natural impossibility. 'How can omnipotency be joined with infinity?' This is a different question. No one will disallow the union of these perfections in the deity: and every man, who knows what he is talking about, will deny the possibility of their separation, or their being joined to a finite being.

In answer to these interrogatories, let me ask this shallow reasoner—p. 12.

He must indeed be a very shallow reasoner, who is moved by any of the following questions.

Art not thou a mystery to thyself? Dost thou not carry about with thee, in thy own being, insuperable difficulties? How canst thou hope to find out the nature and manner of an union betwixt an infinite and a finite nature, when even the union of thy own soul and body is above thy comprehension? Is not the soul, that enlivens thee, hid from thee? Canst thou give an account how it came into thy body, or where the seat of its residence is, or by what way or influence it gives thy body sense or motion? And, as thou art thus a mystery to thyself, so also do not numberless things around thee puzzle thy enquiries? Are not the plants under thy feet as
much

much above thy comprehension as the stars and heavens? Canst thou give any certain account even of the air thou breathest in, or of the light that gives thee the pleasure of all created glories? In the language of scripture, let me ask thee, 'Where is the way where light dwelleth; and as for darkness, where is the place thereof?' Hast thou entered into the treasures of the snow, or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail? Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea, or hast thou walked in search of the deep? Whereupon are the foundations of the earth fastened, or who laid the corner-stone thereof? Canst thou number the clouds in wisdom? Knowest thou the time when the wild goats of the rock bring forth, or canst thou mark when the hinds do calve? Doth the hawk fly by thy wisdom, and stretch her wings towards the south? Doth the eagle mount up at thy command and make her nest ^{hast thou given the hawk its prey?} on high? Hast thou clothed his neck with thunder? Hast thou an arm like God, or canst thou thunder with a voice like him? Which way soever thou turnest thine eyes, art not thou encountered with wonders too great for thy knowledge; and are not the things that touch thee, as unknown and distant from thee as the poles? Has not even the meanest produ^t in nature something in it that fools thy enquiry, and forces thee to disbelieve the evidence of thy senses, or to acknowledge the weakness and insufficiency of human reason? P. 12. 13.

A most sublime passage! Eloquence, at which all who had the happiness of hearing it, must have been amazed! Yet, are the points here enumerated matters of revelation? May we not be ignorant of them, and well-informed notwithstanding, on such subjects as are professedly revealed to us? What theologian in his senses pretends to display the essence of the deity; the manner in which he exists, and enjoys his perfections?

fections? Yet every christian has some degree of ability to examine what, in fact, his Creator has been pleased to divulge. Whether, for instance, the being, who was born, preached, suffered death, &c. be *represented in the gospel* to have been God himself, or only his servant, one who bore his commission. Whether that messenger *appears in those records* to have been begotten from all eternity; or created in time, though before all worlds; or to have had no existence previous to his conception in his mother's womb. Whether the motive that prevailed with the Almighty to publish the redemption, was his own intrinsic benevolence and free mercy; or whether he was influenced by any external inducement, and for an equivalent paid. These are points which any one who can read may arrive at the knowledge of. *What say the Scriptures?* This is all the Unitarians desire to learn: and think it not necessary to be able to solve all Mr. Harrison's questions before they can receive an answer. They leave hard words, unintelligible phrases, and useless speculations to the corruptors of our holy religion who introduced, and to their posterity, who retain them. They have this confidence in the gospel, that whatever is manifestly shocking to common sense, cannot, they presume, be a doctrine of genuine christianity.

Canst thou then think it strange, that the God of nature ~~who~~ should be incomprehensible, when his whole creation is one great prodigy? And surely religion may claim the same privilege as philosophy, the book of God, as the book of nature! Little it is that God has given us power to know of himself in the greater or smaller volume of his works, his world, or his scriptures, in both which are equally displayed the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. P. 13, 14.

We

We do not think it strange, we acknowledge it to be fact, that the God of nature is incomprehensible, as to his manner of existence. What we deny, is a *revelation*, such as Mr. Harrison proposes, that turns out nothing but a *puzzle*; a religion designed for the use of all men, which no man can understand. The scriptures pretend not to give us any insight into the nature of the deity, his mode of being; any more than the visible creation. All we can learn from either of these volumes, are such of his perfections as relate to ourselves; his wisdom, power, and goodness; and the paths in which it is his pleasure we should walk, for the attainment of happiness in this world and the next. These things are clearly discovered by philosophical experiment, and scriptural investigation. But if we be curious to know *what* the Almighty is, we shall find nothing to satisfy us either in his word, or his works.

But we may be certain, that all the knowledge we acquire by his word is unquestionably true, because it is the dictate of that spirit, who only knows the nature, counsels, and operations of the deity, and is himself the God of truth and knowledge. P. 14.

In these positions we perfectly agree, whatever may be our diversity of opinion concerning the interpretation of that word; and I am glad to see the Spirit of God acknowledged to be God himself, and not a third part of the undivided trinity. He knoweth the counsels of the deity, as the spirit of a man knoweth the things of a man. (1 Cor. ii. 11.) I am happy also to hear the following concession :

It

It is true we may, nay, we are commanded, to search and examine the scriptures, and see whether those doctrines we call mysteries, are revealed in them.

P. 14.

Here our preacher for a moment affects protestantism. Yet he soon perceives he is going too far; and assumes the point in debate, by taking it for granted we shall find exactly what he wishes.

But, when, upon a candid examination and fair trial, we have found this most evident truth, 'God was manifested in the flesh;' though reason resists, and the understanding is non-plussed and swallowed up in the inexplicable contemplation of an infinite eternal God, and a finite man, substantially united in the same person, and dwelling upon this habitable earth; still we are to submit, not dispute; to believe, not argue; to adore the wisdom we cannot fathom, and reverence the counsels we cannot penetrate. P. 14.

What pity is it that so fine a period should go upon a false supposition? If we do read, 'God was manifested in the flesh,' in the scriptures, and if it be a most evident truth; still Mr. Harrison's interpretation of it is a most evident absurdity.

This is the proper work of faith; reason is not to be the sole arbiter in points of this nature. P. 14.

Faith is an assent to any proposition, on the credit of the proposer. Let us first be assured that God has declared these doctrines called mysteries, and that the expositions of holy writ, called

called orthodox, are the genuine *mind of the Lord*. Of this, reason is the only judge:

Let it be remembered, that reason laughed at that, in Sarah, which faith in Abraham embraced and rejoiced in. p. 14, 15.

Sarah saw three persons, whom she understood to be mere men, come into Abraham's tent; and while she was preparing them refreshment, overheard one of them say, she should have a son. It does not appear from the history, that she knew the speaker to be authorized by the Almighty, so she *laughed within herself* at the idea, which, from her own age, and that of her husband, was, according to the common course of nature, improbable. Upon perceiving that what had passed only in her own mind, was detected; and being asked, *Is any thing too hard for the Lord?* she denied, and was afraid. Abraham, from his farther converse with his guests, was acquainted with their being messengers of Jehovah; and yielded, as he ought, implicit assent to what was nothing more than a prediction of a miracle. Had he not known that the speaker was addressing him in the name of Jehovah; or had he been told, that the son to be born should be the infinite eternal God, he would perhaps have lent what Mr. Gibbon calls a very *academic faith* to it. But, when he was convinced that God was speaking to him, by his messenger, his reason did not resist; nor was his understanding nonplussed and swallowed up in any inexplicable contemplation. In both these characters, faith and reason had their proper work; nor can they be produced as typifying those, who implicitly follow the decrees of holy church, on the one hand; or

or those, who are advocates for the use of reason in matters of religion, on the other.

In the following sentence we most readily acquiesce :

But even reason, if it be not intoxicated with pride and arrogance, must acknowledge, that God can neither be deceived, nor deceive others ; he may as well deny his being as falsify his word : the mind of man cannot possibly desire more evidence for the belief of any truth than this,—that God hath revealed it. p. 15.

All this is nothing to the purpose, till it is proved that God hath revealed the doctrine of the trinity.

But still, say our adversaries, must we believe a doctrine that is big with absurdity and contradiction ?—In answer to which, we may lay it down for an undoubted truth, that we should fully comprehend a doctrine, before we can venture to affirm, that there is absurdity or contradiction in it ; and, since the union of God and man in the same person is confessedly above the comprehension of a finite understanding, it is the highest absurdity to affirm, that there is a contradiction in it ; for, why should the conjunction of the deity with the humanity of Christ be esteemed a greater contradiction, than the union of soul and body in one man ; things of a quite opposite and different nature ; the manner of which, as I have observed, is obscure, mysterious, and inexplicable. p. 15.

If we ought to comprehend a doctrine before we can affirm there is either absurdity or contradiction in it, ought we not equally to comprehend it, before we affirm that there is not ? or indeed,

indeed, before we say any thing about it, lest we should talk of what we do not understand; which is *the highest absurdity*. When our preacher has proved the conjunction of the deity with the humanity of Christ to be a doctrine of scripture, it will then be time enough to talk of the inexplicable union between soul and body. In the interim, I would wish him just to confute a flimsy book, written by one Priestley, called, I think, *Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit*.

And now, my venerable auditors, judge between me and the unbeliever. Ye have heard the evidence; What think ye of Christ? Was he, as the apostle asserts, God manifest in the flesh; or, as a modern skeptic has impiously dared to affirm, the son only of Joseph and Mary! P. 15., 16.

Let us enquire to whom this appeal was made. The Lord Mayor, the Judges, the Aldermen, the Serjeants at Law, the Sheriffs, and City-Officers.* A company truly respectable! But such an one as reminds us, not of a congregation of private Christians, assembled to worship God, and be instructed in his word; not of a college of apostles; nor of an ecclesiastical synod met to frame articles for a national church; but of “the princes, the governors, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, who came to the dedication of the image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up.” (Dan. iii. 2.) The orator appears to have perceived this resemblance. For, as we shall soon discover, he imagines those to whom he addresses himself, like the rulers of another *Babylon*, capable of supporting

* Vote of thanks prefixed.

ing any mode of worship the civil power had established; of commanding that a furnace should be heated one seven times more than it was wont; and that *Shadrash*, *Melshach*, and *Abednego*, servants of the living and most high God should be bound, and cast into the burning fiery furnace. If, indeed, these august personages be as good judges of a sermon, as of things which come officially before them, there is no doubt they perceived how the evidence had been tampered with; and, after all, came not up to the point.

If, from the testimony that has now been adduced, ye are convinced, that the divinity of Christ is clearly revealed in the sacred records; are satisfied, that the scheme of man's redemption could stand consistently only upon this great foundation, that Jesus Christ was God and man; and find that the philosopher is foiled even upon his own ground,—being not only a mystery to himself, but also encompassed by a variety of wonders, which he cannot possibly account for; you will then, in your respective stations, endeavour that my labour shall not this day be in vain. As members of that church which God's own right hand hath planted, and whose interests are so closely connected with that of this country; that the same ruin which will overwhelm episcopal palaces, will, most probably, also bear down those of kings, nobles, and judges; and bring distress upon the community at large: You will stand up for the purity of its doctrines against every gainsayer, and do your utmost to protect it against its adversaries of every denomination: being thus instruments in the hands of God of fulfilling this promise of its great founder, 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' p. 16.

We here return to the point from which we started :

Permit me now to intreat your attention, as judges of a cause which I have in hand against the corruptors of that faith, which was once delivered to the saints. The interests of the church and state are in the constitution of these realms so intimately connected, that the ruin of the latter will, most probably, follow that of the former. You therefore, who are appointed guardians of the laws of the state, will undoubtedly, for your own and the public safety, look with a jealous eye upon every enemy of the church, but particularly those daring adversaries, who endeavour to destroy the chief corner-stone thereof, &c. p. 1, 2. Vide supra.

This is speaking out. The civil magistrate is intreated, conjured, as the safety of the community is dear to him, as he is a member of the church of Christ, to commence a persecution. A few months before, our preacher was more diffident. He was prompted by an equal degree of sanguinary bigotry; but he doubted the right of the magistrate to interfere in matters of religion. In a sermon, preached by him, before the same audience, on the first Sunday in the preceding Easter Term, we read, p. 9. ‘ And now, if
 ‘ ever, religion implores the magistrate’s assistance,
 ‘ to maintain the honour of God and his truth,
 ‘ and stand up to execute judgment upon those
 ‘ impious mortals, who divest the great author
 ‘ and founder of our faith of his divinity, and
 ‘ reduce the creator of all things, to the condition
 ‘ of a creature. Pardon my zeal, should it have
 ‘ led me in this respect to overleap the magistrate’s
 ‘ duty. I am not insensible, that it hath been
 ‘ much

much, and warmly disputed, whether magistrates have any thing to do with the religious tenets and opinions of the subject: but, admitting they cannot punish, gratitude surely will lead them to discountenance, such impiety; gratitude to him, who hath said, 'ye are Gods,' will induce them, by every means in their power, to consult and guard his honour, who hath thus distinguished and exalted them. But, though the *religious opinions* of men should not be under the jurisdiction of magistrates, yet I think it has been generally admitted, as an incontestible point, that their *irreligious actions* are properly within their cognizance, &c.* Whether, therefore, the magistrate has, or has not, a right to interfere with the religious opinions of individuals in the community, let the statute of William and Mary be enforced. Thanks to the forbearance of those who are entrusted with the civil power, who are become wiser than their teachers, and more charitable than the ministers of the gospel: this Baal, unto whom our mighty orator crieth aloud, after his manner, sleepeth, and must not be awakened. If, however, it should be roused, not only Unitarians, but those who declare there are two Gods, the one to be reconciled, the other to accomplish what was necessary for the purpose, will have cause to tremble.* Well betide the day in which Mr. Harrison laboured, it is to be hoped, *in vain*; as it was not

E 2

in

* By statute 9 and 10 W. III. c. 32. if any person educated in the christian religion, or professing the same, shall by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any one of the persons in the holy trinity to be God, or maintain that there are more gods than one, he shall undergo the same penalties and incapacities, which were just now mentioned to be inflicted on apostacy by the same statute.' Blackstone iv. 50.

*in the Lord, nor a labour of love, to blow the trumpet for a persecution! He may have been retained to plead this cause: but it is not the cause of Christ. Before they begin this good work, the magistrates will consider whether the church, they are to do their utmost to protect, be in truth the church which God's own right hand hath planted: whether the means recommended for its support do not plainly indicate a consciousness, that it will receive no succours from heaven. The church of Christ flourished, and grew to eminence, not only without the aid, but in opposition to the temporal power. It is that of antichrist which is advanced by the rulers of this world. The church of Christ is, in its principle, universal love, comprehension and forbearance; that of antichrist, limitation, hatred, and intolerance. The precepts of the former are, that we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for the second coming of our Lord and master: the doctrines of the latter are mysteries; and worldly splendor its expectation. "*Revelation and mystery*, says a writer, are in their very natures as diametrically opposite to each other, as light and darkness, Christ and antichrist." In short, the two societies are no more the same, than the woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars, (Rev. xii.) is the same with her, whom the prophet afterwards saw, (ch. xvii.) arrayed in purple; whose name was mystery; who was drunk with the blood of the saints, and of the martyrs of Jesus; and was seated upon the beast, supported by the civil power. It is this latter community that is connected with the state: the former admits no such alliance, as being *not of this world*.*

A farther

A farther question to be resolved, is, whether the ruin of the state will most probably follow that of the established church? whether the same ruin which will overwhelm episcopal palaces, will most probably bear down those of kings, nobles, and judges, and bring distress upon the community at large? Were episcopal palaces to be overthrown by an earthquake, most probably those of our kings and nobles would be in danger, and the community much distressed. But if the progress of unitarianism be the only convulsion we dread, there is no great occasion to be alarmed. Suppose, for a moment, that candidates for degrees, for orders, and institutions, were to subscribe nothing but a declaration of their belief in the scriptures; and the liturgy read in your churches, were exchanged for the reformed one, according to the plan of Dr. Clarke; why should this alteration be attended with greater ruin to episcopal palaces than has already overwhelmed them from the substitution of Tate's Psalms for those of Sternhold? Why might not bishops continue to fill the office prescribed them by St. Paul; (1 Tim. iii. 2. Tit. i. 7. compare 2 Cor. iv. 4—10, with Rev. xviii. 11—19) discharge every part of their duty, which belongs to them as pastors and overseers of a christian flock; and even exercise their rights as temporal peers? Is it to be credited, in these enlightened times, that the repeal of the test-act would affect the success of our fleets and armies; make our officers less gallant; and dispose our men to mutiny and desertion? Does the strength of the Tower of London depend on the act of uniformity; or would Windsor castle moulder into dust, if the statute of William and Mary no longer disgraced our *protestant* country? Foreign trade, I warrant, cannot subsist without your canons; nor could the supplies be raised with-

out

out the book of homilies; Let the revenues of ecclesiastics remain as they are at present; and let them be an *imperium in imperio*, as long as the state shall think fit to endure them: but let them not be considered as necessary to the welfare of the state, from the support they give to the christian religion. They are no more connected with the genuine gospel than the East India Company. Let them not be suffered to pillage and imprison those who have sense and integrity to declare their sentiments. This is the only method by which their existence can probably affect the community. If they be permitted to persecute their fellow-subjects, they may give birth to such retorts, as may shake to its center the civil authority that is mad enough to forbear suppressing them. Believe me, it is not any system of christianity, as established by human laws, against which we are assured, the gates of hell shall not prevail. The ruin of those wretched compounds of tyranny and falsehood, throughout Europe, we see every day approaching; and their utter subversion will serve hereafter as an incontestible proof of the truth that was in Jesus.

Such is the discourse, the *excellent sermon**, which Mr. Harrison in the year 1788, the centenary of the glorious revolution, had the courage to deliver, in the metropolis of the kingdom, before the chief magistrate, and a venerable assembly of judges and lawyers; to print it, and disseminate it for their private meditations†. Whether he has more insulted their understandings, or outraged their feelings, I will not determine. Suffice it for me, my friend, to declare, that ‘ I have long looked on liberty of conscience as one of the rights of human nature, antecedent to society, which no man could give up, because it was

* Vote of thanks prefixed.

† Ibid.

' was not in his own power: and our saviour's
 ' rule of doing as we would be done by, seemed
 ' to be a very exprefs decision to all men, who
 ' would lay the matter home to their own con-
 ' science; and judge, as they would willingly be
 ' judged by others'. In consequence of this, I can-
 not but regard with abhorrence, not the person,
 but the principles of a man, who can so far forget
 his character of a minister of the gospel of peace;
 of a religion, which was to annihilate all distinction
 between jew and gentile, and admit only one
 hope, one Lord, one baptism, ONE GOD, and Father,
 of all; as to *intreat* and *implore*, that those of his
 fellow christians, who, though they interpret not
 the scriptures in the manner that he does, yet have
 the same veneration for *them*, and pay the same
 ready obedience, in civil matters, to the laws of
 his country, with himself,—should be proceeded
 against with all the rigor prescribed by an unchristi-
 an act of parliament, in which the legislature
 arrogated powers that belong solely and exclu-
 sively to Christ, as delegated by the Most High-
 est. However we may continue, my friend, to
 differ upon these speculative topics, I shall use
 my utmost endeavours that our mutual regard
 shall not be abated; for I have so learned Christ,
 as to be convinced, that THE END OF THE COM-
 MANDMENT IS CHARITY, OUT OF A PURE HEART,
 AND OF A GOOD CONSCIENCE, AND FAITH UN-
 FEIGNED.

I am, with the most sincere affection,

and truest cordiality,

6 JU 65

Your's, &c.

B. J. Garrison

E R R A T A.

- P. 13. the last line, put a full stop after *choice*.
20. l. 10. for *ambiguity*, read *ubiquity*.
25. l. 3. for *the* superior, read *a* superior.
— l. 16. dele *if*, and the first *of*.
39. l. 3. (from the bottom,) for *supercede*, read
supersede.
42. l. 17. after *on high*? insert, *Hast thou given*
the horse strength?
43. l. 8. (from the bottom,) dele *who*.

